

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/084,526 | 02/26/2002 | Nan Tsung Huang | 7790 | |
| 25859 | 7590 08/10/2004 | | EXAM | INER |
| WEI TE CHUNG FOXCONN INTERNATIONAL, INC. 1650 MEMOREX DRIVE SANTA CLARA, CA 95050 | | | DONG, DALEI | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2879 | |

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 10/084,526 | HUANG, NAN TSUNG | | | | |
| navicery nearen | Examiner | Art Unit | 00/ | | | |
| | Dalei Dong | 2879 | P- | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | ars on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence add | ress | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 30 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). | | | | | | |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dath have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extens 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moterned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | sion and the corresponding amount of the statutory period for reply originally set in | fee. The appropriate ext the final Office action; or | ension fee under (2) as set forth in | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. | | | | | | |
| NOTE: | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject | · · · | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request fo application in condition for allowance because: Se | | sidered but does NC | OT place the | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | cause it is not directed SOLELY | to issues which we | re newly | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | and an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: 1-10. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: 11-20. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app | proved or b) disapproved by | the Examiner. | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme | nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). | · | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the argument provided by the Applicant deemed not persuasive. Examiner asserts that it is old and well known in the art to have mount optical transmitting and receiving modules on a printed circuit board by the prior art of record and thus Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combine the printed circuit board of Yingst with the optical module of Yonemura in order to provide back support as well as electrical and optical connections to other components of the optical system.

NIMESHKUMAR D. PATEL SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800